

REMARKS

In the Final Rejection of August 1, 2006, no mention is made of a Declaration of Karen M. Slimak under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 filed June 26, 2006. Mention of the showings contained in the Declaration is respectfully requested in the next Office Action.

Furthermore, the Final Rejection states there is insufficient support for the claimed method.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are fully supported. See, e.g., the first paragraph following the “Field of the Invention” for claim 1.

For the disclosure of “tropical root crops,” see the same paragraph. For specific crops recited in claim 20, see, generally, the titles of the related patents incorporated by reference on page 1 of the specification, as well as page 9, 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph.

Applicant is claiming a method, each of the steps of which are clearly supported in the original description. Thus, although the Examiner takes issue with whether such method would be “effective” in treating a specific disease, symptom or condition, the amended claims no longer rely on the specific disease, symptom or condition for patentability but, rather, on the specified steps of the method, which are found wanting in any of the cited art.

Accordingly, the application should be in condition for immediate allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko  
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/mat  
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31413DIV

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.  
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 785-0100  
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: February 1, 2007